UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,555	07/05/2001	Sadhana S. Rau	16159.010001; P5909	1645

22511   7590   04/08/2005

OSHA & MAY L.L.P.
1221 MCKINNEY STREET
SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
REFAI, RAMSEY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	.

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 November 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are pending in the application.

　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-36</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 July 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Responsive to Amendment filed November 24, 2004. Claims 2-4 have been amended.

Claims 1-36 are pending.

Specification

1.   The disclosure is objected to because the serial numbers of cross-referenced applications

have not been updated.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 7, 12, 14-19, and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mendez (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,606) in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted

Prior Art).

4.   As per claim 1, Mendez teaches a method for propagating changes from a local

workspace that is accessible by a client to a remote workspace that is accessible by a server,

comprising:

generating a request from the client to the server for a workspace (**abstract, Figure 1**

and 7; instantiator);

obtaining selected data from the local workspace and requesting the server to store the

selected data in the workspace (**abstract**); and

updating the remote workspace with the data in the workspace (**abstract**).

5.   Mendez fails to teach creating a temporary workspace.

6.   However, AAPA teaches creating child workspaces with copies of the parent workspace,

which are, used temporary (**paragraph [0007]**). It would have been obvious to one of the

ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez and AAPA because AAPA's use of

creating temporary workspace in Mendez system would allow for a developer to obtain a copy of

the parent file and modify it without interfering with the work of other developers.

7.   As per claim 7, Mendez teach obtaining selected data from the local workspace

comprises determining a set of different files between the local and remote workspaces

(**abstract**).

8.   As per claim 12, Mendez teach checking for physical existence of the local workspace

and requesting the server to check for physical existence of remote workspace prior to requesting

the server to create the temporary workspace (**column 5, lines 9 – 13; network connections**).

9.   As per claim 14, Mendez teaches updating history of transactions in the remote

workspace after the remote workspace is updated (**column 11, lines 10 – 40**).

10.   As per claim 15, Mendez teaches updating history of transactions in the local workspace after the remote workspace is updated **(column 11, lines 10 – 40)**.

11.   As per claim 16, Mendez teaches deleting the workspace after the remote workspace is updated **(abstract)**.

12.   As per claim 17, the claim contains similar limitations as claim 1, therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

13.   As per claim 18, Mendez teach a authenticating the client prior to sending selected data to client **(Figure 8 and column 10, lines 50 –55)**.

14.   As per claims 19, 31-36, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 1, 7, 12, and 15-16 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

15.   Claims 2-6, 13, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mendez (U.S. Patent No. **6,151,606**) in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art) in further view of Bayeh et al (U.S. Patent No. **6,098,093**).

16.   As per claim 2, Mendez and AAPA fail to teach at least one servlet parses requests sent

to the server and delegates processing of the requests to an appropriate server object in the

server.

17.   However, Bayeh et al teach the use of servlets and servlet engines to facilitate client

requests (**Figure 3 and column 8, line 42 – column 9, line 19**). It would have been obvious to

one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez, AAPA and Bayeh et al

because AAPA's use of creating temporary workspace and Bayeh et al's use of servlets in

Mendez system would reduce system overhead and execute quickly because servlets are

automatically threaded and are highly responsive.

18.   As per claim 3, Mendez teach a remote workspace is stored in a repository (**column 4,

lines 52-63**).

19.   As per claim 4, Mendez teaches a server object implements an interface having a set of

methods that can be invoked to access the repository and the remote workspace (**column 2, line

10 – column 3, line 15**).

20.   As per claim 5, Mendez fails to teach the client communicates with the server using

HTTP protocol.

21.   However, Bayeh et al teach the use of HTTP protocols (**column 1, lines 20-30**).). It

would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of

Mendez and Bayeh et al because Bayeh et al's use of HTTP protocol in Mendez system would allow for a client to communicate to a server via the Internet to exchange messages.

22.   As per claim 6, Mendez fails to teach the client communicates with the server using HTTPS protocol.

However, Bayeh et al teach the use of HTTPS protocols **(column 1, lines 20-30).)**. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez and Bayeh et al because Bayeh et al's use of HTTPS protocol in Mendez system would allow for a client to safely communicate to a server via the Internet to exchange messages.

23.   As per claim 13, Mendez teach the use updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary workspace **(abstract)**.

24.   Mendez and AAPA fail to teach a server locking method.

25.   However, Bayeh et al teach a server with a locking technique to prevent servlets from overwriting each other **(abstract and column 12, lines 29 – 58).)**. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Mendez, AAPA and Bayeh et al because AAPA's use of creating temporary workspaces and Bayeh et al's use of a locking technique in Mendez system would prevent other users access to remote workspace while the user it obtaining a file or updating a file from the remote workspace.

26.   As per claims 25-29, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

27.   Claims 8-11, 20-24, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Mendez (U.S. Patent No. **6,151,606**) in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art), and

in further view of Maddalozzo, Jr. et al (U.S. Patent No. **5,878,218***).*

28.   As per claims 8 - 11, Mendez teaches the use of different files in different workspaces

(abstract).

29.   Mendez and AAPA fail to teach the use filenames and checksums to determine the set of

different files, comparing the filenames and checksums, having files with checksums that differs

from that of a corresponding filename in the set of different files and having files that include a

filename that differs from the set of different files.

30.   However, Maddalozzo, Jr. et al teach the use filenames and checksums to verify file

availability, file difference and checksum differences in the set of different files **(column 9, line**

15 – column 10, line47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to

combine the teachings of Mendez, AAPA, and Maddalozzo, Jr. et al because AAPA's use of

creating temporary workspace and Maddalozzo, Jr. et al's use of comparing files using filenames

and checksums in Mendez's system would allow a user to obtain a copy of a file from a remote

workspace into a temporary workspace, verify that they are different and then modify the file in

the temporary workspace. Once modification is complete, a user can then check file availability

in the remote workspace and if not available, transfers file to the remote workspace and check if

the entire file has been transferred using checksums.

31.   As per claims 20-24 and 30, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 8-11

above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

32.   Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- In the remarks, the applicant argues in substance that:

     A. Mendez and AAPA fail to teach the following:

          - creating a temporary workspace;

          - storing selected data into the temporary workspace;

          - updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary workspace;

            and

          - checking for physical existence of the local workspace and remote

            workspace prior to requesting the server to create the temporary

            workspace.

     B. Mendez fails to teach generating a request from the client to the server for a

         workspace;

     C. Mendez teaches the use of an interface but the present invention requests

         permission directly from the server to create a workspace without intervention of

         an interface;

     D. AAPA does not imply in any way the use of a temporary workspace;

     E. Bayeh fails to teach the following:

- creating a temporary workspace;

- storing selected data into the temporary workspace;

- updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary workspace; and

- checking for physical existence of the local workspace and remote workspace prior to requesting the server to create the temporary workspace.

    F.   Maddalozzo does not teach using the filename and checksum to determine a *set* of different files.

- In response to:

    A.   The examiner respectfully disagrees because:

      o AAPA does teach creating a temporary workspace. Although AAPA does not use the word *temporary,* AAPA does teach the creation of child workspaces that are used by developers provisionally in order to modify individual versions of the same file without interfering with work of other developers **(paragraph [0007])**;

      o AAPA teaches storing the selected data into the temporary workspace. A version of the same file from the parent workspace is selected and copied onto the child workspaces **(paragraph [0007])**. Mendez also teaches storing selected data into a temporary workspace. Data is downloaded from a remote site in order to manipulate data. A general synchronization module synchronizes the manipulated data with the workspace data stored at the remote site **(abstract)**;

o   AAPA also teaches updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary

    workspace. AAPA teaches that developers modify copies of parent workspace

    files in child workspaces. After the files are modified in the child workspaces,

    they are merged and copied to the parent workspace **(paragraph [0007])**. Mendez

    also teaches updating the remote workspace with data in the temporary

    workspace. Data is downloaded from a remote site in order to manipulate data. A

    general synchronization module synchronizes the manipulated data with the

    workspace data stored at the remote site **(abstract)** and

o   Mendez teaches checking for physical existence of the local workspace and

    remote workspace prior to requesting the server to create the temporary

    workspace. Mendez teaches that the system may include additional information

    such as network connections, memory, etc. before transferring the information

    (column 5, lines 9-13).

B.   The examiner respectfully disagrees because Mendez does teach generating a

request from the client to the server for a workspace **(abstract).** An instantiator requests

the workspace data manager provide workspace data using an interface to manipulate

access and synchronize workspace data **(column 2, lines 10-35).**

C.   Applicant it arguing that Mendez teaches the use of an interface but the present

invention requests permission directly from the server to create a workspace without

intervention of an interface. This/These limitation(s) are not found in the claims. Claimed

subject matter not the specification is the measure of the invention. Disclosure contained

in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding prior art. In

re Sporck, 55 CCPA 743, 386 F .2d 924, 155 USPQ 687 (1986); In re Self, 213 USPQ 1,

5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, 15 (CCPA 1978).

Applicant's specification does teach the use of an interface to communication with the

server.

> "[0021] Referring now to the accompanying drawings, FIG. 1 shows a block
> diagram of a teamware system 5 that allows transactions to be executed between a
> local workspace 10 and a remote workspace 15. The local workspace 10 is local
> in the sense that a teamware client 20 uses local access methods or a network file
> sharing protocol to access the contents of the local workspace 10. The remote
> workspace 15 is remote in the sense that the teamware client 20 does not use local
> methods or a network file sharing protocol to access the contents of the remote
> workspace 15. In the figure, the remote workspace 15 is shown inside a
> repository 25, such as described in U.S. patent application Ser. No. _____,
> entitled "Teamware Repository of Teamware Workspaces," herein incorporated
> by reference. In accordance with this embodiment, the teamware system 5
> includes a teamware server 30 that manages and provides access to the repository
> 25 and remote workspace 15. *The teamware client 20 communicates with the
> teamware server 30 via an application programmer interface (API).* The
> teamware client 20 executes the transaction logic locally and sends certain
> commands to the teamware server 30 to be executed at the teamware server 30.
> The result, such as the content of a file, an object, or an exception, is returned to
> the teamware client 20."

Claim 4 of the instant application also states:

> "4. The method of claim 4, wherein a server object implements *an interface
> having set of methods that can be invoked to access the repository and the remote
> workspace.*"

D.   The examiner respectfully disagrees because AAPA does imply in any way the

use of a temporary workspace. AAPA does teach creating a temporary workspace.

Although AAPA does not use the word *temporary,* AAPA does teach the creation of

child workspaces that are used by developers temporarily in order to modify individual

versions of the same file without interfering with work of other developers **(paragraph [0007])**.

E.   The examiner asserts that Bayeh was used to in combination with Mendez and AAPA to teach some of the limitations that were not taught in Mendez or AAPA not to teach creating a temporary workspace; storing selected data into the temporary workspace; updating the remote workspace with the data in the temporary workspace; and checking for physical existence of the local workspace and remote workspace prior to requesting the server to create the temporary workspace. These were taught in Mendez and AAPA. Please see response to point A above.

F.   The examiner respectfully disagrees because Maddalozzo does teach using the filename and checksum to determine a *set* of different files. Maddalozzo teaches "A requesting computer 12A *to send the newest version of file 14F which is resident within the "common cache" and which is more current than and different from the copy of file* 14F in local cache 33AC. Method step 118 accomplishes this by sending the query to computer 12A with *the timestamp and checksum* for the copy of file 14F in cache 33AC" **(column 10, lines 6-13).**

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ramsey Refai whose telephone number is (571) 272-3975. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

                                                            Ramsey Refai
                                                            Examiner
                                                            Art Unit 2154

RR
March 22, 2005
                                    JOHN FOLLANSBEE
                            SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
                            TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100